

SPRINGPORT, MICH.
 Sanitized - Approved For Release CIA-RDP75-00
 SIGNAL

Weekly - 661

Front Edit Other
 Page Page Page

Date: DEC 26 1963

THE FEDERAL BUDGET: WHERE DOES THE MONEY GO? By Senator Hart

CPYRIGHT

Not even the weather comes in for the steady flow of criticism that the federal budget gets. In the weather's case, a few sunny days can evaporate a lot of hard feeling.

But the budget stays on and digs in, growing by the year until many a taxpayer--like the farm boy who daily lifted his calf--begins to wonder if the time is near when he can longer bear it up.

Naturally, everyone is for frugality. But how can it be best achieved? The conservatives hammer away at the government's domestic programs. They charge that these are undermining state and local authority. They imply that good, hardworking citizens are being taxed to care for the lazy and improvident. Senator Goldwater flatly sees the budget as evidence of the growing welfare state.

But it seems to me that it's less an indication of the welfare state than the warfare state.

Fully 55 per cent of your federal tax dollar will be spent by the armed forces. An additional eight per cent goes for interest on the war debt. Four per cent goes for military and economic aid to foreign countries, certainly an important part of the defense structure. Add to this other cold war costs--the space program, the diplomatic corps, the CIA etc.--and the total comes to 80 per cent.

That leaves only about 20 per cent for those "welfare programs" that the conservatives attack so vigorously--programs that include heart and cancer research, aid to depressed areas, school lunches, urban renewal, weather forecasts, protection against harmful food and drugs, water pollution control and others.

It may be that there is some waste in that 20 per cent, and waste here should be opposed as vigorously as anywhere else in the budget.

But it strikes me that the budget cutters are biting into the small end of the pear. That other 80 per cent, just by size alone, presents a more promising target.

And it can be significantly reduced only as world tensions are reduced. It seems equally clear that any easing of tension must depend heavily on continued communication and negotiation between opposing nations.

Here, however, Senator Goldwater--and, presumably, his followers--balk. Negotiations imply co-existence and the Senator will have none of that. Unhappily, in refusing to condone co-existence, he doesn't tell us which nation is to cease existing. The United States is not prepared to do so and it is unlikely that Russia will volunteer.

So I believe we must continue exploring new ways to make the military standoff less costly. The test ban treaty points the way for one. A joint moon venture, as proposed by the President, might provide another.

It is true that any serious steps toward disarmament seem very remote at the moment. But I keep remembering how remote a test ban looked one year ago. Maybe the situation won't change, but I don't think we should discourage the possibility.

to be a rough and rocky one. But I can't see how any to be a rough and rocky one. But I can't see how any serious...
 Sanitized - Approved For Release CIA-RDP75-00149R000300480006-4
 It could save not only money, . . but mankind as well.